



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,021	06/25/2001	Terry R. Lee	M4065.0407/P407	6645
24998	7590	10/11/2005	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP			VU, TRISHA U	
2101 L Street, NW			ART UNIT	
Washington, DC 20037			PAPER NUMBER	
			2112	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/887,021

Applicant(s)

LEE, TERRY R.

Examiner

Trisha Vu

Art Unit

2112

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____

REHANA PERVEEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
10/6/05

Trisha Vu
Examiner
Art Unit: 2112

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 09-16-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

1) Regarding Applicant's argument "terms "shield" and "ground shield" in the specification refer specifically to shield lines 60 illustrated in drawing FIGS. 3, 4, and 5" (page 13), it is noted that nowhere in the specification discloses "shield" and "ground shield" refer to shield lines 60, nor "shield" and "ground shield" are "shield lines". Applicant stated that "Shield lines 60 connect between circuit element 58 and connector 52" (page 13), however this is just the way Applicant interpreted the Drawing, in fact there is no such "shield lines" being disclosed in the specification. And the Examiner might interpret the "line" being just a symbol to represent a separation between each pair of signal lines wherein a ground shield is provided inbetween.

2) Applicant further stated "the shield or ground shield can not be merely a coupling between a pin of a connector to ground, but instead must be lines..." (page 15), again Applicant has not provided a definition or description in the specification which support for this shield/ground shield as argued. Also, "shield or ground shield are merely a coupling between a pin of connector and ground, is contrary to the stated purpose of reducing signal cross-talk of proximately signals on the bus" (page 15), it is brought to Applicant's attention that there is no such contrary, note at least the abstract of Robertson "locating a ground pin between each pair of signal pins may help reduce signal interference, or "crosstalk", thereby improving signal integrity of the memory module", thus the same purpose of reducing signal cross-talk is obtained.

3) Regarding the objection to the Drawing "connector device 152 having a plurality of connectors electrically connected to the processing unit... where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or labeled representation (e.g. a labeled rectangular box)" (page 16), however, according to the specification and the drawing, the labeled rectangular boxes are more likely representing the pins of connector device 152 than representing a plurality of connectors of the connector device 152, since if they are representing the plurality of connectors than each signal will be coupled to a separate connector as shown in the drawing, which is not true..